

Moving Jewish Educators to the Next Stage in Their Career

An Evaluation of New York University's Dual Master's and Doctoral Programs in Education and Jewish Studies

Yael Kidron, Mark Schneider, David Blumenthal, Nicole Massengale

OCTOBER 2015



Moving Jewish Educators to the Next Stage in Their Career

An Independent Evaluation of New York University's Dual Master's
and Doctoral Programs in Education and Jewish Studies

OCTOBER 2015

Yael Kidron, Mark Schneider, David Blumenthal, Nicole Massengale



Contents

Introduction1

Quality Indicator 1 | Offer students customized learning plans aligned with
their skills and career goals.9

Quality Indicator 2 | Provide students with opportunities to develop professional
competencies in field-related work.12

Quality Indicator 3 | Support the development of leadership competencies.15

Quality Indicator 4 | Promote a caring and supportive learning environment.18

Quality Indicator 5 | Connect students to organizations, associations,
and networks in the field of Jewish education.21

Summary.25

References28

Appendix A. Doctoral Dissertations, Professional Presentations, and Articles
by Fellows (Last Three Years)32



Introduction

The doctoral and dual master's programs in Education and Jewish Studies are a collaboration between the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development and the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at New York University (NYU). The Jim Joseph Foundation has awarded a grant of \$4.96 million to NYU during the period 2009–2015 to improve the infrastructure of the two programs and to attract outstanding prospective students (Jim Joseph Foundation fellows).

The design of the programs was based on several assumptions (NYU, 2013): (1) there is a fast-growing need in the field of Jewish education for well-trained professional leaders with the highest level of academic achievement; (2) academic and professional training in Jewish education should equip students to provide educational programs for diverse student populations in terms of denomination, culture, and prior Jewish learning; (3) graduate students should be given access to the widest possible range of faculty guidance from professors involved in curriculum theory and practice, sociology of education, philosophy of education, history of education, administration, technology, early childhood, and applied psychology; and (4) students should have access to rigorous coursework in Jewish studies.

American Institutes for Research (AIR) conducted an independent evaluation of this grant. This evaluation assessed the extent to which the doctoral and dual master's programs have provided what students need to become successful educators and educational leaders in Jewish education. This evaluation addressed three questions:

1. According to fellows, to what extent did their programs promote applicable knowledge, attitudes, and networking?
2. To what extent have fellows engaged in leadership roles in the field of Jewish education after graduation?
3. To what extent do fellows attribute engaging in thought leadership to their doctoral and dual master's programs?

This study used a qualitative inquiry methodology to explore the experiences of students, which is a common methodological approach in research on higher education when a study's sample size is small and individuals' narratives are diverse (Anderson & Anderson, 2012; Golde & Dore, 2001; Maki & Borkowski, 2006). The evaluation team conducted initial and follow-up phone interviews with the 24 recipients of the Jim Joseph Foundation fellowships under this grant. The interviews inquired about professional experience and academic background, career goals, academic courses and other professional development, professional networking, current employment, and leadership experiences. In addition, the evaluation team conducted interviews with academic advisors and reviewed program materials. To validate the formation of a framework and quality indicators for the review of the programs, the team conducted comprehensive literature review and interviews with employers of the fellows. The evaluation team synthesized the data collected to determine the level of programs' capacity to prepare students for leadership roles in Jewish education and the impact of the programs on students to date.

It is important to situate the evaluation within the context of desirable student outcomes. These are outcomes or competencies that students should develop beyond the specific outcomes identified by course instructors and reflect professional readiness to engage in

leadership roles. To identify categories of competencies, the evaluation team supplemented the interviews with NYU faculty members and students with additional interviews with faculty members and students from programs in two other prominent universities: The George Washington University (GWU) and Stanford University.

GWU's program in Experiential Education and Jewish Cultural Arts is the only master's program of its kind in the United States, offering an intensive, year-long, cross-disciplinary curriculum in Jewish Cultural Arts, Experiential Jewish Education, and Museum Education. This master's program emphasizes the importance of combining content and creativity and offers a hands-on approach to experiential education through site visits and projects.

Stanford University's Doctoral Concentration in Education and Jewish Studies is a unique interdisciplinary initiative that seeks to promote innovative research at the intersection of Education and Jewish Studies. Doctoral students combine contemporary educational models (e.g., the diversity of ways in which people learn) and Jewish studies (e.g., the varieties of Jewish experiences) to conduct original research in Jewish education.

Common themes from interviews with members of the three institutions enabled the evaluation team to identify competencies that the programs develop through rigorous coursework, exposure to multiple disciplines, hands-on experience in teaching, communal service, research, and close mentoring. All programs in the three institutions discussed here have been funded by the Jim Joseph Foundation.

Developing Competencies for Educational Leadership

The roles of educational leaders are multiple and complex and require multiple skills. The research on educational leadership identifies several categories of leadership skills, each aligned with a different type of leadership style or leadership behavior. For example, researchers suggest that the skills needed for transformational leadership—a leadership style that includes establishing a long-term vision and motivating and inspiring others—include a deep understanding of the educational field and human development as well as communications skills (Lopez, 2014). Another category, communitarian leadership—a leadership style that focuses on building a community while acknowledging the rights and perspectives of individual members of the community—requires an understanding of the needs of diverse groups and the ability to analyze situations and navigate political situations (Baxter, Thessin, & Clayton, 2014). A third category, educational thought leadership, involves informing the educational community about the state of the field and designing innovative solutions to persisting educational gaps or problems. Relevant skills include content expertise and the ability to link theory and practice (Ravitch, 2010).

Advanced degree programs that aim to prepare educational leaders vary in their quality (Levine, 2005). The programs that have received the highest marks for preparing leaders who can meet the demands of 21st century jobs integrate the practical lessons of academic coursework and ground them in the day-to-day realities of schools. These programs link coursework and field-based learning experiences to help students become reflective practitioners who integrate theory with practice (Wrenn & Wrenn, 2009). These programs also provide ample mentoring and advisory programs to support personal and professional growth (Hale & Moorman, 2003). Using such research as a framework, this report examines NYU's doctoral and dual master's programs in Education and Jewish Studies. Specifically, this report assesses the extent to

which these programs include practices identified by experts as effective in promoting leadership competencies.

The effectiveness of advanced degree programs should be discussed in the context of the goals the programs aim to accomplish (Buchanan, 2008; Levine, 2005). Typically, higher education institutions focus on student retention, completion of degree requirements, and job placement as metrics for measuring student success (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2015). In this report, we discuss a different set of outcomes—the leadership competencies that master’s and doctoral students can gain to advance in their careers as educational leaders in Jewish education settings.

The evaluation team developed categories of leadership competencies through interviews with faculty members and students in NYU, GWU, and Stanford and a literature review. Exhibit 1, which depicts these categories, covers a wide range of leadership levels, from project manager to executive director. The leadership competencies are organized by five areas of professional responsibilities or actions—each supported by a set of competencies that may be developed as part of an advanced degree. For example, Managing With Agility is supported by preparing the student to work in a variety of roles and educational settings and to become familiar with different educational approaches and models.

Exhibit 1. Competencies of Jewish Educational Leaders



- 1. Managing With Agility** is defined as being able to manage in environments characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity as well as managing with openness and adaptability. It involves the ability to effectively fulfill one's professional responsibilities while attempting new ways of doing or viewing things or managing unexpected events and new requirements. This leadership competency has an affective component (e.g., emotion regulation) and a cognitive component (e.g., identifying and understanding alternative models of program operation) (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). Increasingly, this competency is recognized as an important part of preparing effective educational leaders (Kivunja, 2015).

This theme was expressed by master's and doctoral students and their faculty members in relation to two contexts: job placement and dynamics of the work environment. First, students and faculty felt that students should be prepared for a variety of positions in different occupational settings (e.g., academia, Jewish day schools, community centers, congregations) and in different geographical regions and types of Jewish communities. Such preparation will make students more competitive job candidates and, importantly, will enable them to successfully transfer from one workplace to another.

Second, there was a consensus among faculty members that students need to prepare for volatile work environments. In such environments, they need to be able to update or transform practices and use new insights informed by research evidence and expert knowledge to question conventional approaches. For example, leaders should become consumers of the latest research (in Jewish and public education) and other knowledge bases to gain new insights about promising practices.

Universities can help students consider perspectives from sociology, psychology, history, social justice, and public policy as they analyze educational issues. In our interviews, students noted that taking courses in different departments and having conversations with professors who have diverse areas of expertise expanded their horizons and enabled them to consider issues in a multifaceted way.

- 2. Problem Framing and Problem Solving** is defined as the ability to identify and analyze problems, weigh the relevance and accuracy of information about the problem, and generate alternative solutions. Acquiring problem-solving skills as part of a degree-awarding program best occurs as part of fieldwork, where students become acquainted with the problems that exist in the organization and have the opportunity to define and analyze these problems (Knowlton, 2003). For example, according to one student: "The organization where I did my internship was going through transition. It was really interesting and helpful to understand how the organization rebranded itself and restructured. Especially, the dilemmas and conversations about what they lost and what they gained in the process."
- 3. Informed Decision Making** is defined as balancing diverse views and beliefs and using data and other evidence to reach solutions. Informed decision makers should have strong knowledge of the topic and the ability to build on the shared expertise of colleagues and experts within or outside the organization. Students need to develop the capacity to translate theory into practice to apply relevant knowledge to the decision-making process (Burrell, Rahim, Hussain, Dawson, & Finch, 2011). The translation of theory into practice includes being able to differentiate between applicable and nonapplicable models and review the merits of each alternative solution with regard to feasibility, implications, and

impact (Burrell et al., 2011). The application of theory into practice also involves ethical and moral considerations as well as self-reflection about one's behavior and its implications on the interpersonal dynamics in the school or organization. Therefore, it is crucial that students' acquire this competency as part of their fieldwork and that it is supported by mentoring and academic learning (Garcia, 2009).

- 4. Program Design or Redesign** is defined as selecting, revising, or developing educational programs to meet the mission of the school, organization, or larger community. The academic education that graduate programs provide can equip students to serve the research and practitioner communities vis-à-vis knowledge construction. For example, students can consider the linkage between conceptual developments across social sciences and humanities and how these emerging approaches can inform the construction of community engagement programs (Gilvin, Roberts, & Martin, 2012). In interviews, faculty members and students noted the importance of being able to transfer tangible information about pedagogical practices and intellectual property about theoretical frameworks from general education to Jewish education. Students noted that this transfer of knowledge includes both a design and implementation component of program development and a communications component—being able to discuss in simple and clear terms the value of the new programs with practitioners and families.
- 5. Strategic Planning** is defined as identifying and anticipating market needs and setting a long-term strategic vision for systemic improvement. Strategic planning may have an entrepreneurial component—accomplishing the mission of the organization through creative and innovative ideas (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Academically prepared and research trained professionals can build on existing knowledge to solve or at least to contribute significantly to the solution of the major problems at the organizational level (Anderson, 2013; Enders, 2005). Faculty members noted several important abilities that they are seeking to develop through the programs. These abilities include becoming a critical and discerning consumer of educational research and educational programs and using such critical thinking skills to generalize from one field to another or combine old and new ideas as part of a new model. For example, leaders of organizations can build professional development programs for their staff that are powerful learning journeys over time, rather than traditional training events (Lurie, 2015). The competencies that support strategic planning can include understanding the diverse perspectives of stakeholders representing the community and other organizations (Kruss, Visser, & Aphane, 2012). For students who pursue academic careers, this category can be rephrased to focus on identifying real-world research agendas that have an impact on the research and practitioner communities (Gilvin et al., 2012).

In summary, in this section, we outlined core leadership competencies that together form an important foundation for Jewish education professionals across settings and leadership levels. These core competencies align with expert-identified elements of thought leadership—the ability to use knowledge of past and present practices and their outcomes to shape the future of learning (Thomas, 2004). In the following sections, we discuss program components and practices that can enrich the graduate experience and help students grow leadership competencies. The program components discussed in the next sections aim to go beyond knowledge and skills to cover other supporting conditions for successful degree completion and career advancements, including learning environment and professional connections in the field.

A Framework for Academic Preparation of Jewish Educational Leaders

A framework for programs in higher education is the backbone of any evaluation and capacity-building system because it clarifies what programs provide to students and how well they perform in observable and measurable terms. The evaluation team developed a Jewish Educational Leadership Professional Growth Model to organize and analyze the data collected.

Professional Experience and Commitment

The top arrow in Exhibit 2, depicting the professional experience and commitment of students, precedes the other two elements of the model because it includes the students' knowledge and experience prior to program enrollment. Our model assumes that graduate programs targeting experienced professionals should have a different design than programs that target individuals with little or no prior relevant knowledge or experience. Programs that aim to prepare thought leaders in the field of Jewish education will be successful to the extent to which they serve individuals who are already on such a professional path.

Exhibit 2. Jewish Educational Leadership Professional Growth Model



Higher education institutions typically screen applicants to distinguish those who are likely to succeed in the program and those who are not. A common predictor of success is the prior academic coursework of applicants (Huss, Randall, Patry, Davis, & Hansen, 2002; Luce, 2011). Prior to enrollment at NYU, all the Jim Joseph Foundation fellows had taken courses in Jewish studies as part of an undergraduate degree, rabbinic ordination, or participation in other programs such as Drisha Institute for Jewish Education's Beit Midrash, Mechon Hadar's Summer Beit Midrash, and the Pardes Institute of Jewish Studies' Pardes Year Program. In addition, some of the fellows had participated in professional development programs such as Yeshiva University's Experiential Jewish Education Certificate Program or studied in various yeshivas in the United States or in Israel.

Prior, relevant professional experience also is a predictor of success in graduate school (Micek, Kim, & Weinstein, 2011; Nelson, Canada, & Lancaster, 2003). All fellows had multiple years of professional experience in Jewish education settings, and most of them worked in leadership roles such as rabbis, teacher leaders, curriculum developers, and camp directors.

Finally, a common practice in recruitment of prospective students is to request a goals statement as part of the admissions process. In the field of Jewish education, it may be particularly important to seek assurance that the applicants have a clear understanding of the field and the roles that they can play in it. Interviews with fellows indicated that, at the time of enrollment, fellows had three common types of vision: (a) a passion for innovating in Jewish education; (b) a vision for addressing challenges in Jewish education; and (c) a belief in the importance of intellectual rigor as part of field development.

Quality Graduate Program

The second arrow, depicting the quality graduate program, is at the center of the model and the main focus of this evaluation. It addresses five quality indicators. Did the program:

1. **Offer students customized learning plans aligned with their skills and career goals.** Academic advisors help students identify relevant courses from different departments and schools at the university. Advisors guide an informed course selection to ensure that the academic learning provides the knowledge and skills that students need for their desired careers.
2. **Provide students with opportunities to develop professional competencies in field-related work.** Academic advisors help students find internships, assistantships, and salaried jobs based on students' professional goals. Students have access to mentors in the field.
3. **Support the development of leadership competencies.** Students receive multiple opportunities to develop and practice leadership competencies, including workshops and seminars, ongoing consultation by academic advisors, and access to relevant courses, conferences, and field experience.
4. **Promote a caring and supportive learning environment.** Students have multiple opportunities to connect with faculty and peers. Faculty members develop personal, caring relationships with students.
5. **Connect students to organizations, associations, and networks in the field of Jewish education.** Academic advisors and other faculty members introduce students to organizations and networks in Jewish education. Students receive support for presentations, publications, and participation in professional meetings in the field.

Other Supports

The third arrow in Exhibit 2, depicting other supports, includes the concurrent influences of additional fellowships and grants that students receive and the professional networks they develop during their time of enrollment at NYU. Academic advisors encouraged fellows to pursue fellowships that can further their specialization, professional connections, and leadership competencies. One of the fellows received a Charlotte W. Newcombe Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship Award in the field of ethical and religious values. Several fellows were selected to participate in the Wexner Graduate Fellowship/Davidson Scholars Program, which was established by The Wexner Foundation to encourage promising candidates to successfully

meet the challenges of professional Jewish leadership. Jim Joseph Foundation fellows at NYU who have benefited from this program noted that the program provided supported the development of their leadership skills and helped them build a network of people to support their development and growth. Another example of learning opportunities is the Master's Concentration in Israel Education offered by the iCenter for Israel Education. This program provides a specialized curriculum in Israel education, mentoring, and learning in Israel. A dual master's student who participated in this program developed an Israel education curriculum, led a trip to Israel, and gained a professional network of colleagues with interest in Israel education.

Quality Indicator 1

Offer students customized learning plans aligned with their skills and career goals.

Rating Criteria



Emerging Capacity

1. Students have access to a large selection of courses (across the institution and through collaborative agreements with other institutions).



Moderate Capacity

Same as Emerging Capacity, plus:

2. Academic advisors help students to match courses with students' interests and professional goals.



Strong Capacity

Same as Moderate Capacity, plus:

3. Courses and advisors enable students to connect theory and research-based practice to application in the context of Jewish education.



Very Strong Capacity

Same as Strong Capacity, plus:

4. Academic advisors regularly guide students through a reflection process on the extent to which courses have helped them advance toward their professional goals.

Research Evidence

This quality indicator assesses the extent to which programs tailor the learning experience to students' needs. Customized learning plans can be achieved through a flexible curriculum structure that allows students to select courses from different departments in the same university or other collaborating universities. Offering students access to a wide selection of courses can increase student satisfaction with the program and the likelihood that students will acquire skills useful for their careers (Larson, 2013; Wendler et al., 2010). A flexible curriculum structure may be especially important to individuals imagining a professional track of less "traditional" jobs in Jewish education (e.g., innovative experiential education) as well as individuals who may be considering becoming self-employed or providing consultancy services in Jewish education. In the context of doctoral education, access to courses in different disciplines also can enable students to work toward new and innovative ideas and knowledge synthesis (Coron, 2010; Kandiko & Kinchin, 2013).

A common challenge identified by higher education research is students' lack of understanding of degree requirements, learning priorities that can support career aspirations, and how to select courses that match one's goals (Babad & Tayeb, 2003; Golde & Dore, 2001). Administrators and faculty need to recognize how and why students choose their courses and provide personalized advisory on curricular choices (Takacs, 2007).

The Education and Jewish Studies dual master's and doctoral programs received a rating of “Strong Capacity.”

In the course of their interviews, all fellows described the large selection of courses available to them from different departments and schools at NYU. Taking courses from other departments enables students to deepen their learning in specialized fields such as media and gaming, arts, and nonprofit management. Fellows taking the doctoral program also had access to courses offered under the Inter-University Doctoral Consortium or could choose to sign up for an independent study on a specialized topic in the Steinhardt School. NYU is one of the seven universities that have partnered with the iCenter for Israel Education to offer a master's concentration in Israel education to graduate students. As part of this program, students study a common curriculum, gather for 12 colloquium days, receive individual mentoring, and create their own learning experience in Israel.

Dual master's students had two advisors, one from the Steinhardt School and the other from the Skirball Department. Doctoral students had assigned advisors at the beginning of their programs, whose place was taken by the doctoral committee and the head of the doctoral committee. Advisors held multiple meetings with fellows to reflect on professional interests and the job opportunities and discuss course selection. Students reported feeling comfortable to openly discuss career aspirations with their advisors and solicit advice on course selection. Advisors recommended courses based on students' interests. Advisors' course recommendations took into account students' career aspirations as well as their prior experience with rigorous coursework in Jewish studies, education, and other relevant areas of study. Two fellows felt that they could not take full advantage of these supports because there were no spots available for them in the courses that they were most interested in.

The programs offered several courses about the history of Jewish education as well as contemporary topics in Jewish education. Most of the dual master's students chose a capstone project in Jewish education over the traditional master's thesis. In addition to the knowledge that students garnered through academic courses, advisors recommended books and articles to support further learning. Fellows reported that their advisors were highly accessible and willing to discuss books and other resources and help students think about new ideas in Jewish education.

Nearly all the fellows chose to enroll at NYU because they were looking to broaden their knowledge through courses in general education and interactions with scholars who are from outside the Jewish community. Interviews with NYU faculty indicated that fellows were expected to use the tools they acquired in the education classes to translate educational research findings into practice in the Jewish education context. At the time of enrollment, all fellows had strong ties to the Jewish community, commitment to the field of Jewish education, and professional experience in Jewish education. Students were expected to use these prior experiences to make the connection between research-based practice and application in Jewish education.

Interviews with faculty and employers indicated that it is important to encourage students to look beyond what is currently known about the needs of the field of Jewish education and identify new directions for innovation. The primary purpose of the degree programs that fellows have attended at NYU is to equip them with the knowledge and critical thinking skills that enable them to “think outside the box” and examine educational concepts from an informed, yet fresh, perspective. Advisors encouraged students to develop a strong understanding of the history of

the field they are interested in to be able to develop a long-term perspective, including ideas for innovation and transformation. Advisors also encouraged students to select courses that will later enable flexibility in career choices.

Doctoral students saw their core doctoral seminar as an important course that enabled them to grapple with contemporary issues in Jewish education as well as meet with guest speakers representing foundations and nonprofit organizations. Similarly, master's students saw their yearlong seminar as a useful and practical part of their degree. The seminar was designed to support students' exploration of the translation of theory into practice and reflections of professional practice in the context of specified work environments.

Academic advisors were described by fellows as highly accessible, caring, and warm. Students reported feeling comfortable e-mailing advisors or requesting a meeting every time they had a question or a need for advice. At the same time, master's students felt that much was left to students' own style in terms of initiating contact with advisors. There was no evidence that academic advisors had an explicit and deliberate strategy to guide students through an ongoing process of reflection on professional growth, identifying gaps, and finding learning opportunities to address these gaps.

Students' Perspective

I was looking into social work, nonprofit management, and Jewish communal leadership. I wanted something more than one degree with one track could offer.

This year, I was fortunate to take a course with Rabbi Jonathon Saxe on Jewish leadership, and I actually teach a course on leadership in the high school as well. So, I incorporated a lot of the learning from his course into my course in high school.

I had the opportunity to take classes with professors who were visiting professors from Israel, which was fantastic because they taught about really contemporary issues.

Faculty's Perspective

In Jewish day schools, there isn't a lot of prepackaged stuff. They tend to rely on teacher competence more than some other schools might. Therefore, if you have really competently prepared teachers, you're going to be at a significant advantage. That's the beauty of the kind of preparation that we provide. I think we have the kind of smart students that can put that kind of stuff together based on the courses they take.





Employers' Perspective

There is no single model of [Jewish educators] preparation because each case is very different. Some may need more background in Jewish texts while others need to know more about adolescent development and how to apply social work models when working in informal settings. Some are naturally gifted in teaching and facilitating but need to acquire administrative skills.

Quality Indicator 2

Provide students with opportunities to develop professional competencies in field-related work.

Rating Criteria

	Emerging Capacity	1. Program directors help students find job placement for capstone projects, internships, and assistantships.
	Moderate Capacity Same as Emerging Capacity, plus:	2. Program directors match job placements with students' professional interests and goals.
	Strong Capacity Same as Moderate Capacity, plus:	3. Students have opportunities to engage in more than one type of field-related work.
	Very Strong Capacity Same as Strong Capacity, plus:	4. Students are assigned mentors who provide guidance and feedback on their work.

Research Evidence

This quality indicator addresses the availability of supports that help students gain professional experience as part of internships, assistantships, and employment opportunities. The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate referred to graduate learning as “a complex process of formation,” a process that entails “not only the development of intellectual expertise but [also] the growth of the personality, character, habits of heart and mind, and the role that the given discipline is capable of and meant to play in academe and society at large” (Walker, Golde, Jones, Conklin Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008, p. 8). It follows that graduate programs should provide learning opportunities that extend beyond academic coursework (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2010; Gardner, 2009). This approach has been widely adopted. Field practice is a quality standard of teacher preparation programs according to the National Academy of Education (Feuer, Floden, Chudowsky, & Ahn, 2013) and a common practice of most educator education programs in the nation (Bullock, 2013). In addition, a common mechanism through which universities promote professional competencies is research or teaching assistantship—opportunities that can grow students’ technical and interpersonal skills (Lei & Chuang, 2009; Roderick, 2009).

The importance of field placements is in the development of practical skills or employability skills. Research suggests training and practice contribute to the development of the awareness and sensitivity needed for educational leadership in the context of constantly changing economic and social environments and diverse and varying assignments (Tewari & Sharma, 2011). As part of such training, students can benefit from observing leaders in action (Yitshaki, 2012). In addition, field placements can support students’ networking and exploration of career options. Graduate schools can help students be successful in their field placements by working out mentoring agreements with the internship providers. Graduate schools should provide guidance on

mentoring expectations and desired characteristics of mentors. Mentors may serve as role models and coaches, and provide counseling and friendship (Bigelow & Johnson, 2001; Johnson, 2002).

In addition to providing opportunities for professional growth, field placements provide financial resources that can improve student retention and completion of program requirements (Akdere & Egan, 2005; Drake, 2011). In a meta-analysis, Gururaj et al. (2010) found that every form of aid is significant in promoting graduate student retention. Financial aid in the form of assistantships has been shown to be critical in graduate student retention (Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Mendoza, Villarreal, & Gunderson, 2014).

The Education and Jewish Studies dual master's and doctoral programs received a rating of "Very Strong Capacity."

The dual master's program placed all students in capstone projects, working as research interns, curriculum developers, or educators in Jewish educational settings. During the first year of the master's program, academic advisors initiated conversations with students about their professional interests and worked with students to identify second-year capstone placements that can serve student interests. Doctoral students reported that being doctoral candidates at NYU helped them find employment during their program enrollment (through NYU connections and their own independent job searches) or receive greater leadership opportunities at their existing workplace. In addition, doctoral students noted that the structure and content of their program enabled cross-fertilization between their studies and field work. They brought ideas from the field work into their dissertation research. They also brought subject matter expertise and organizational practices from their studies into their field work.

Most fellows worked in more than one place or more than one professional role during their enrollment at NYU. All fellows found appropriate field placements. Moreover, students found internships and jobs in organizations with strong reputations that offered models of effective professional practice. The program directors built on their own experiences and alumni connections to match students with work opportunities. Both doctoral and master's students considered their capstone projects valuable because they provided opportunities to work with individuals who were interested in the same specialized professional area.

Dual master's students were matched with staff liaisons who mentored and supervised them during their capstone projects. However, these students varied in their experiences with mentors. Although many were satisfied with the accessibility and counseling of their mentors, a few indicated not having someone with which to talk about challenges or concerns.

Students' Perspective

I got a lot of liberty in my work. I was allowed to create my own curriculum, attempting to reshape Zionist discourse and Israel discourse. I was forced to think about Israel and Zionism again in ways that I haven't had to before.

It was important to me to do actual practice teaching as part of my degree. They [the program directors] connected me with a great school. I spent this year two full days a week either observing or teaching or assisting in the classroom. And then, at the end of the year, I handed in a portfolio of some of the work that I had done.

I gained a lot from being part of a small intimate group of people who share my values and at the same time challenged my values. I learned a lot about myself and how I can present and imagine myself as a leader in that kind of safe setting.

From my experience [taking part in a research project while at NYU], I realized that I really enjoy research, and it doesn't mean that just because I started out as a practitioner that I have to just remain a practitioner. For my future career, I would like to continue to do research in the field.

Faculty's Perspective

Our students get exposure to some of the ongoing issues of institutions, from how to deal with diverse student types to how to resolve a controversy at the museum over the labeling of an exhibit. We are trying to get them to learn how to think for themselves through different issues instead of simply relying on textbooks.

Employers' Perspective

The fact that he is pursuing a doctoral degree has helped us explain to those who do not know him how he can help advance the school mission.

Spending the time in a Jewish day school during that time [of a degree program] is important because it allows you to think about things that work well in the classroom.

Quality Indicator 3

Support the development of leadership competencies.

Rating Criteria



Emerging Capacity

1. Students receive regular announcements about workshops and seminars on management and leadership skills.



Moderate Capacity

Same as Emerging Capacity, plus:

2. Academic advisors engage students in discussions about applying knowledge and skills when engaging in leadership roles.



Strong Capacity

Same as Moderate Capacity, plus:

3. Academic advisors help students find opportunities to practice leadership skills, including presentations, publications, planning, and consulting.



Very Strong Capacity

Same as Strong Capacity, plus:

4. Faculty members guide students through academic inquiry and applied or theoretical research on Jewish educational leadership.

Research Evidence

Jewish educational leadership is a multifaceted concept that encompasses both personal and intellectual skills (Brown, 2007). Today's leaders are often described as nimble and agile while demonstrating the ability to articulate a clear vision and lead their staff through a path to accomplish the vision. A recent increase in the number of articles and books on the topic of innovation and creativity demonstrates the importance this topic to effective leadership, both Jewish and non-Jewish (Jaskyte, 2013). Although innovation is typically discussed in the context of intellectual contribution, it also can take the form of administrative innovation, encompassing changes in organizational administrative processes and organizational structure. There are other leadership competencies that advanced degree programs can aim to promote, such as ethical leadership as a foundation for decision making and action. These examples of leadership competencies reflect the complexity of the concept of leadership and the size of the task of preparing future leaders in Jewish education.

Research indicates that the majority of Ph.D. recipients employed in business, nonprofit, and educational settings consider professional development of interpersonal skills such as collaboration, teamwork, and managerial techniques as well as interdisciplinary research and inquiry skills an important aspect of their doctoral education (Maki & Borkowski, 2006). In addition, integrating critical thinking and analytic skills into academic coursework (Jenkins & Cutchens, 2011) and mentoring (Gettys, Martin, & Bigby, 2010) can play an important role in the preparation of future educational leaders. Faculty members can promote the development of leadership competencies learning by setting up opportunities for critical exchange and inquiry as well as guided research related to leadership qualities (Danby & Lee, 2012).

The Education and Jewish Studies dual master's and doctoral programs received a rating of “Strong Capacity.”

The program directors conceptualized a structure that can help students prepare for a broad range of professional roles. The program directors considered the kind of professional knowledge and skills that inform the work of organizations like Hazon (<http://hazon.org>), Moishe House (<http://www.moishehouse.org/>), and the Institute for Jewish Spirituality (<http://www.jewishspirituality.org/>). These organizations build on original thinking and cutting-edge strategies. Academic advisors also worked to have students consider a broad range of professional opportunities.

Students received the intellectual guidance and support to explore creative directions of Jewish education without being guided to consider any particular setting or path. As a result, all doctoral students and some of the dual master's students produced innovative work that reflected their unique interests and skills. The topics explored by fellows included the use of games for learning, Jewish homeschooling, and the development of religious emotion.

Academic advisors made a deliberate effort to increase fellows' awareness of a wide range of directions in Jewish educational careers. The advisors were concerned that the narrow professional focus that doctoral and dual master's students tended to have at the beginning of the program might be an impediment as it might counteract the freedom that students receive at NYU to broadly and creatively explore ideas and limit the success of job searches.

The approach taken by the Education and Jewish Studies doctoral and dual master's programs has shown positive results. Most of the Jim Joseph Foundation fellows described a significantly greater engagement in professional activities that demonstrate subject matter expertise, such as publishing, presenting papers in conferences, developing teaching materials, and serving as content experts for their communities. Some of the fellows also reported transitioning to management positions and engaging in innovation.

Most of the doctoral students were still working on their dissertations, and most of the master's students were in the first year at their job placements at the time of this evaluation. Follow-up data collection is needed to assess the programs' influence on career paths and leadership practices.

Fellows reported that the combination of specialized courses (e.g., drama, art, game design), overview courses (e.g., organizational change and educational trends), and additional literature recommended by faculty introduced them to new ideas. For example, some fellows explored new instructional practices in Jewish day schools inspired by experiential Jewish education.

Students' Perspective

There's nobody else in the field doing what I've done. I have taken courses with key people in the field to learn how to really capture the attention and the imagination of Jewish learners because we live in an age of choice.

One of the reasons why I enrolled in this Ph.D. program is because I believe that the work of Jewish education needs to be done in a systematic, high-level, academic way.

Now that I am creating a new curriculum for my students, I have a framework for using standards in assessment of literacy skills.

At the end of the day, to make an impact on a Jewish community, it's about connecting the dots. It is about creating a movement from people who are doing different things but in the same community or addressing different points in the same field. My degree will give me enough tools to be adaptable for the opportunities that I can make for myself and that will be presented to me in the next five to 10 years.

Faculty's Perspective

We offer courses that aim to help students understand something about the society that they are in—what issues in Jewish education have become salient and how to deal with those issues. There is a kind of thinking they have to internalize at some point in their lives if they are bound to be leaders. If you put Hebrew in a social context, [then] you need to think what does this mean that you are teaching this language and for what reasons?

You want to know that the students who you are educating now are prepared for a world that [will] be different from our world 30 years from now. That is how you have to think about graduate education. You can't think of it simply as a bunch of courses, which is a mistake that most people make. What you have to do is to think about it in terms of a long-term trajectory of the student [and teach] them how to get the skills to be a leader in a world that is going to change.

Employers' Perspective

We are particularly interested in people who are reflective, thoughtful, who have ideas and opinions, and who can create and lead discourse around education and teaching practices.

Teachers who get leadership responsibility are able to not only engage their colleagues, because they have to coordinate and facilitate with them, but also know how to reach out into the community to coordinate opportunities for the school.

Quality Indicator 4

Promote a caring and supportive learning environment.

Rating Criteria



Emerging Capacity

1. Academic advisors and other faculty members are accessible and responsive to students' questions and feedback requests.



Moderate Capacity

Same as Emerging Capacity, plus:

2. Academic advisors use a holistic approach of student development by supporting students' professional growth and well-being.



Strong Capacity

Same as Moderate Capacity, plus:

3. Students have access to structured opportunities (e.g., seminars, peer mentoring) that promote socialization with peers as part of a safe, caring, and supportive climate.



Very Strong Capacity

Same as Strong Capacity, plus:

4. Programs offer events that promote faculty and students interaction. The event can be academic in nature (e.g., brown bags, colloquia, and workshops), or socially oriented (e.g., potlucks, movie nights, and picnics).

Research Evidence

There is a consensus on the importance of positive and caring learning environment to retaining students in their advanced degree programs (Council of Graduate Schools, 2004). Learning environment is defined here as both the formal and informal spaces where support to students is rendered. Louw & Muller (2014) conducted a literature review of the research on doctoral programs and concluded that promising practices in the area of supportive learning environments include campuswide efforts to bring students together across disciplines for academic and social interaction, aligning supports with students' needs, and visible recognition of student achievements on the institution's website.

Individualized supports are an emergent theme in the literature on learning environments in higher education. Common strategies to achieve a positive environment include opportunities for students' connections with their cohort members (e.g., through shared seminars, critical friends groups, and peer mentoring), one-on-one advising relationships with faculty members, "open-door policy" that fosters student-faculty interaction, and informal, unstructured interactions (Gardner, 2010). Interactions with academic advisors and other faculty members affect graduate students' psychological well-being, academic success, and career aspirations (Antony, 2002; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2005). Academic advisors play an important role in the development of students' academic and professional goals (Lechuga, 2011).

Researchers recommend that academic advisors engage students in thinking about their future by asking questions such as “Where do you see yourself in five years?” or “What experiences do we need to find or create to help you build the competencies you will need in order to be successful?” (Baker & Griffin, 2010). Academic advisors can help students reflect about their personal and professional growth and identify actions that promote their success as students and professionals (Arminio, Roberts, & Bonfiglio, 2009; Vaatstra & Vries, 2007).

Another important form of support is learning communities formed by students (Brown, 2011). Such communities can offer social and emotional support and additional learning and networking opportunities (Smith, Frey, & Tollefson, 2003). The personal, social, and emotional aspects of the learning environment, which include both faculty and peers, play an important role in students’ learning (Entwistle & Peterson, 2004). Opportunities for social and intellectual interactions with peers can promote students’ participation in shared experience and shared meaning. These experiences, in turn, promote a sense of satisfaction with the program and enhanced learning (Maher, 2005).

The Education and Jewish Studies dual master’s and doctoral programs received a rating of “Strong Capacity.”

The dual master’s program requires all students to participate in a two-semester seminar on education and Jewish studies. Similarly, the doctoral program places all doctoral candidates in a two-semester foundational course sequence on the history of Jewish education. Students also are required to take an advanced seminar focused on research in Jewish education before they defend their dissertation proposal. Students described nurturing relationships with the program directors, with many opportunities to be mentored by advisors and professors. A large percentage of the fellows noted that one of the greatest strengths of their program were positive and supportive faculty-student interactions. This rapport between staff and students was consistent in both the master’s and doctoral programs.

Fellows lauded the relationships they have built with other students within their programs. Many students have remained in touch with their peers after completing their degrees. Most students cited their peer relationships as being instrumental to their intellectual growth and the expansion of their professional network. Several students reported a familial atmosphere, noting that this experience seemed unique to the Education and Jewish Studies program. In addition to promoting close relationships with faculty and students, NYU Steinhardt promoted the visibility of students on its website by posting biographical sketches of current students and alumni and sharing news on students’ recent accomplishments.

The small size of the degree program has had two opposing effects on students’ feelings of connectedness. On the one hand, many doctoral students cited the program’s size as contributing to a tightly knit community of like-minded scholars. On the other hand, some master’s students felt isolated or limited in their interactions with others. Fellows noted that because each one of them had a different professional focus, their conversations lacked depth in some cases, because there were pedagogical or conceptual issues that did not apply to all professional settings that fellows engaged in. One interviewee suggested developing or sharing a database of current and graduated students to offer a larger peer network for students with specialized interests.

Fellows also noted that the flexibility that NYU offers in terms of curriculum structure could become a drawback if it were not for the close guidance of academic advisors and the support of their peers. When students are not required to choose a discipline or a track, they have the opportunity to study the courses that are most meaningful to their professional growth. At the same time, they may feel lonely and may experience doubts about the choices they make. Fellows noted that academic advisors and other faculty members helped them connect to experts, peers, as well as professionals outside the university to enable conversations and answer their questions. Fellows, especially those who were actively engaged in building their visibility in the field, reported that one of the most meaningful supports they received from advisors, other professors, and professionals in the field was help with prioritizing their professional activities (e.g., which conference to attend, where to publish, where to intern).

Students' Perspective

Everybody in the program has been very helpful, and I've relied on everyone. I've had long conversations with several of the faculty members, and I've found them all just very accepting and helpful. I feel like they have invested a lot of time and energy in me as a student. I feel like I can show up at any faculty person's office and sit down and talk to them.

When I selected my classes, I talked with other students because I wanted to know if the class was good and if the professors understood our Jewish education and our Education and Jewish Studies program. For example, I took a social studies class, and the professor was really understanding and tried to get us a class that would match the needs of students from the education and social studies program so [that] I could focus more on Jewish history and stick with what I was trying to be trained in.

The doctoral seminar provided a forum for us to meet. It created a family atmosphere that is hard to find when you're in grad school.

Faculty's Perspective

I view education as handmade, particularly at the doctoral level. I think that students need a lot of support, not just with regard to where they are headed professionally. Not all students are confident all the time, and it is important to just be there for them, be a good listener, keep them on track, and catch students when they are using their time in a nonproductive way.

Quality Indicator 5

Connect students to organizations, associations, and networks in the field of Jewish education.

Rating Criteria



Emerging Capacity

1. Programs send regular announcements of upcoming conferences and other networking and professional opportunities in the field of Jewish education.



Moderate Capacity

Same as Emerging Capacity, plus:

2. Programs provide seminars and individualized support to help students write or prepare for presentations, publications, grant applications, or participation in initiatives in Jewish education.



Strong Capacity

Same as Moderate Capacity, plus:

3. Academic advisors and other faculty members introduce students to key people in organizations, associations, and networks in the field of Jewish education.



Very Strong Capacity

Same as Strong Capacity, plus:

4. Academic advisors continually encourage professional socialization of students and identify networking opportunities that match individual students' strengths and professional goals.

Research Evidence

This quality indicator addresses support services that facilitate students' professional networking. Research has shown that individuals' networks influence career outcomes, including job satisfaction and attainment, promotion and advancement, and overall career success. Supports for professional networking development can increase future job prospects and strengthen graduate students' identity as integrated professionals in the field (Sweitzer, 2008).

Publication venues include journal articles, blogs, lesson plans, and informational materials for nonprofit organizations. These opportunities can help students gain confidence in their skills, network to specific community groups, and broaden their portfolios (Mizzi, 2014). Networking with educators and educational leaders creates opportunities for encouragement and support, sharing of ideas, collaboration on educational initiatives, and joint efforts that can mobilize funding and affect policy and practice (Meyers, Paul, Kirkland, & Dana, 2009). The path to thought leadership involves identifying and interacting with current thought leaders in the field (Mizell, 2010).


The Education and Jewish Studies dual master's and doctoral programs received a rating of “Very Strong Capacity.”

Several factors contributed to the enhanced professional networking of students, including the reputation of faculty and their connections with schools, nonprofit organizations, foundations, and associations; connections of NYU alumni; and connections of peers. For all fellows, and especially those who felt limited by the small cohort in their NYU program, networking offered an important venue to connect with professionals who specialize in the same educational practice. For this reason, The Wexner Foundation fellowship and conferences of professional associations were highly valued experiences. Fellows were responsible for requesting help from academic advisors and faculty members to identify networking opportunities, to prioritize those opportunities, and to gain access to key events and professional meetings. Some fellows reported that they had strong networks that they have developed in parallel to their program enrollment independently of NYU program support. They saw the primary contribution of NYU as providing connections to types of communities that they did not have access to in the past.

To assess changes in professional networking, this study uses a social network analysis technique that depicts graphically the connections of fellows with organizations and associations in the field of Jewish education. In this chart, the nodes are people and organizations, and the lines connecting nodes denote connection through affiliation or participation in activities. Associations in networks, such as the ones depicted here, can serve as conduits for the flow of information, resources, and collegial support. Exhibit 3 depicts the professional networks of fellows prior to enrollment at NYU. Fellows had more localized professional connections, which were tied to a synagogue, school, or a branch of a camp. Note that these connections represent work relationship, participation in professional meetings, or other professional activities. This chart does not take into account additional personal connections (e.g., friending someone on LinkedIn or Facebook) that fellows may have with professionals in the field of Jewish education.


Exhibit 4 depicts the professional connections of fellows at the time of this study. As this exhibit shows, the number of organizations and number of connections between students and organizations more than doubled between the time of enrollment and today. In addition, the overlap among the professional networks of fellows has increased. Fellows have increased the number of their connections both to local organizations (e.g., Jewish day schools, Jewish community centers, congregations, nonprofits) and to entities that have a central presence in the field, such as RAVSAK, the Network for Research in Jewish Education, the Association for Jewish Studies, The Jewish Education Project, and the Jewish New Teacher Project.

Exhibit 3. Social Network Analysis of Connections With Organizations Prior to Enrollment



Created with NodeXL (<http://nodexl.codeplex.com>)

Exhibit 4. Social Network Analysis of Connections With Organizations After Enrollment



Created with NodeXL (<http://nodexl.codeplex.com>)

Students' Perspective

I'm very grateful I ended up going to NYU because it allowed me to become familiar with a lot of organizations and institutions that I wasn't familiar with beforehand. When I graduated, I knew exactly what I wanted to do. I knew that there aren't many positions for the type of work I want to do. So, I spent most of my time networking until this position opened up.

My network grew broader. It grew in avenues where I previously didn't have a foothold. I didn't have any contacts in the academic sphere.

The peers who were in my cohort, or one above or one below, served as insiders to a community that I didn't know.

I participated in the NRJE [Network for Research in Jewish Education Emerging Scholars] Mentoring Seminar. It was a networking and mentoring opportunity that helped me see how I can be part of the Jewish education field.

Faculty's Perspective

Having a setting where senior and junior professors meet with students and invite practitioners and foundation people to discuss research and issues of the day is an important part of the formation of graduate students.

Employers' Perspective

From my perspective, the Jim Joseph Foundation fellows are an example of one plus one equaling three or four or five. When you have multiple inputs offered to the right person, you are creating a whole that is far greater [than the sum of its parts]. I don't think that NYU alone can provide it. I don't think that any Jewish institution or organization alone can provide it. But I think that NYU can identify the right people that can help create multiple forms of expertise so that their students can create something that doesn't yet exist.


Summary

The Education and Jewish Studies doctoral and dual master's programs successfully recruited students who had prior professional experience in Jewish education and records of relevant academic learning in Jewish studies. At the same time, these programs assumed that students' prior opportunities to learn and needs for skill development were highly variable.

The Jewish Educational Leadership Professional Growth Model situates quality indicators of graduate programs in the context of prior academic learning and professional experience and concurrent supports. It aims to outline the key aspects of a program's capacity to offer comprehensive educational experience that matches individuals' professional aspirations. The individualized and rigorous nature of the programs is assumed to enhance professionals growth as thought leaders in Jewish education.

Thought leadership is defined as the championing of new directions through writing, speaking, and teaching, advocating, and planning (McCrimmon, 2005). Thought leadership can be exercised through multiple professional roles including business entrepreneurship, new program development, and academic research. Unlike traditional leadership models, thought leadership does not require the management of others rather it is centered on "individuals' ability to illuminate paths to the future that others can follow" (Butler, 2012, p. 1). Two common abilities of thought leaders are engagement of others within the same or different organizations and having relevant expertise (Gibbins-Klein, 2011). Based on these definitions of thought leadership, we propose that the combined impact of initial professional experience and commitment, degree programs, and other supports promotes the three pillars that enable individuals to serve as thought leaders: knowledge and skills, career pathways, and professional networking (Exhibit 5).

Exhibit 5. Relationship Between the Leadership Growth Model and Student Outcomes



Based on review of the NYU doctoral and dual master's programs in this report, we conclude that the programs help match students' aspirations to the realities of the job market in the field of Jewish education. Overall, students felt well-prepared to assume more advanced professional roles compared with their pre-degree employment, and they had a clear concept of their suitability for a variety of professional settings.

With regard to the first research question of this study, “To what extent did the Education and Jewish Studies doctoral and dual master’s programs promote applicable knowledge, attitudes, and networking?” we conclude that based on the five quality indicators described in earlier sections, the programs promoted both academic knowledge and field experience aligned with fellows’ professional goals. The programs provided highly customized education, which enabled inquiry and exploration of concepts, practices, and professional involvement in the field.

For the second research question, “To what extent have fellows engaged in leadership roles in the field of Jewish education after graduation?” our data indicate that the fellows engaged in multiple aspects of leadership roles, including management and coordination responsibilities. Using their academic training, fellows have served as experts on program and curriculum development and Judaic studies. Exhibit 6 shows the main categories of employment of fellows prior to and after enrollment at NYU. The left side of the diagram shows that prior to enrollment, fellows gain professional experience as educators in museum, camp, Jewish

Exhibit 6. Professional Roles of Fellows Prior to and After Enrollment at NYU



day school, congregational school, and programs for young adults settings. Some of the fellows had rabbinical training prior to enrollment. In addition, a few of the fellows had professional experience working for nonprofit organizations and foundations. As the right side of Exhibit 6 shows, fellows have advanced to positions that entail greater supervisory responsibilities and expertise. Fellows reported supervising interns and junior staff, being in key decision-making roles, and serving as content experts for their organizations or programs. Fellows described creating new organizations, service lines, products, curricula, and resources for their stakeholders. Appendix A lists recent publications and professional presentations by fellows, demonstrating the wealth of knowledge created and expanded on by these scholars. Because most of the doctoral students have not yet completed their programs and several of the master's students are currently working in jobs that they may consider as a stepping stone for other professional opportunities, additional follow-up is needed to assess engagement in thought leadership in the field of Jewish education.

To address the third research question, "To what extent do fellows attribute engaging in thought leadership to their doctoral and dual master's programs?" we analyzed all fellows' reports across all five quality indicators. Fellows indicated that their programs have given them access to research knowledge, vocabulary, and ways of thinking that can be gained only in an institution that enables a large selection of courses across disciplines taught by recognized experts in the field. In addition, fellows noted the contribution of NYU to their field experience and networking.

The framework developed through this study can support important conversations about the role of advanced degree programs in Jewish educational leadership development. It also can serve as a tool for assessments of program capacity development in higher education. Further elaboration on this model is needed to test and clarify its applicability to varying models of advanced degree programs that aim to prepare individuals for leadership roles in Jewish education.

References

- Akdere, M., & Egan, T. M. (2005, May 29–June 1). *An examination of higher education and community partnerships: Implications for institutional research*. Paper presented at the 45th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Diego, CA. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491034.pdf>
- Anderson, T. D. (2013). The 4Ps of innovation culture: Conceptions of creatively engaging with information. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 18(3).
- Anderson, S., & Anderson, B. (2012). Preparation and socialization of the education professoriate: Narratives of doctoral student-instructors. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(2), 239–251.
- Antony, J. S. (2002). Reexamining doctoral student socialization and professional development: moving beyond the congruence and assimilation orientation. In J. C. Smart & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 17, pp. 349–380). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Arminio, J., Roberts, D. C., & Bonfiglio, R. (2009). The professionalization of student learning practice: An ethos of scholarship. *About Campus*, 14(1), 16–20.
- Babad, E., & Tayeb, A. (2003). Experimental analysis of students; course selection. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(3), 373–393.
- Baker, V. L., & Griffin, K. A. (2010). Beyond mentoring and advising: Toward understanding the role of faculty “developers” in student success. *About Campus*, 14(6), 2–8.
- Baxter, V., Thessin, R. A., & Clayton, J. (2014). Communitarian leadership practice acquisition in educational leadership preparation. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 9(2), 10–27.
- Bigelow, J. R., & Johnson, W. B. (2001). Promoting mentor-protégé relationship formation in graduate school. *Clinical Supervisor*, 20(1), 1–23.
- Brown, C. J. (2011). Learning communities or support groups: The use of student cohorts in doctoral educational leadership programs. *VCU Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2378. Retrieved from <http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3377&context=etd>
- Brown, E. (2007). Personal, institutional, and communal leadership: Rethinking leadership development for the Jewish Community. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 82(3), 234–243.
- Buchanan, J. (2008). Developing leadership capacity through organizational learning. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 5(3), 17–24.
- Bullock, S. M. (2013). Learning to teach and the false apprenticeship: Emotion and identity development during the field experience placement. *Advances in Research on Teaching*, 18, 119–140.
- Burke, W., Marx, G. E., & Berry, J. E. (2011). Maintaining, reframing, and disrupting traditional expectations and outcomes for professional development with critical friends groups. *Teacher Educator*, 46(1), 32–52.
- Burrell, D. N., Rahim, E., Hussain, K., Dawson Jr., M., & Finch, A. (2011). The future of doctoral education for educational administrators in leadership and critical thinking. *Review of Higher Education & Self-Learning*, 4(13), 108–116.
- Butler, G. (2012). *Think write grow: How to become a thought leader and build your business*. Australia: Wiley.
- Coron, K. (2010). Entrepreneurs' education and training environment: A multicultural perspective. In A. Fayolle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education* (pp. 122–152). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Council of Graduate Schools. (2004). *Ph.D. completion and attrition: Policy, numbers, leadership, and next steps*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Danby, S., & Lee, A. (2012). Researching doctoral pedagogy close up: Design and action in two doctoral programmes. *Australian Universities' Review*, 54(1), 19–28.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., La Pointe, M., & Orr, M. T. (2010). *Preparing principals for a changing world: Lessons from effective school leadership programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus*, 16(3), 8–12.
- Enders, J. (2005). Border crossings: Research training, knowledge dissemination and the transformation of academic work. *Higher Education*, 49(1/2), 119–133.
- Entwistle, N. J., & Peterson, E. R. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education: Relationships with study behavior and influences of learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 41(6), 401–406.
- Feuer, M. J., Floden, R. E., Chudowsky, N., & Ahn, J. (2013). *Evaluation of teacher preparation programs: Purposes, methods, and policy options*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education. Retrieved from http://naeducation.org/cs/groups/naedsite/documents/webpage/naed_085581.pdf
- Garcia, E. J. (2009). Raising leadership criticality in MBAs. *Higher Education*, 58(1), 113–130.
- Gardner, S. K. (2009). Special issue: The development of doctoral students—Phases of challenge and support. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(6), 1–127.
- Gardner, S. K. (2010). Faculty perspectives on doctoral students' socialization in five disciplines. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 5. Retrieved from <http://ijds.org/Volume5/IJDSv5p039-053Gardner293.pdf>
- Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 369–387.
- Gettys, S. G., Martin, B. N., & Bigby, L. (2010). Does mentoring assist in developing beginning principals' instructional leadership skills? *International Journal of Evidence-Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 8(2), 91–110.
- Gibbins-Klein, M. (2011). Winning by thinking: How to create a culture of thought leadership in your organization. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 25(1), 8–10.
- Gilvin, A., Roberts, G., & Martin, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Collaborative futures: Critical reflections on publicly active graduate education*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, The Graduate School Press.
- Golde, C. M., & Dore T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia, PA: The Pew Charitable Trusts. Retrieved from <http://www.phdcompletion.org/promising/Golde.pdf>
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gururaj, S., Heilig, J. V., & Somers, P. (2010). Graduate student persistence: Evidence from three decades. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 40(1), 31–46.
- Hale, E. L., & Moorman, H. N. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership and Edwardsville, IL: Illinois Education Research Council. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504276.pdf>
- Huss, M. T., Randall, B. A., Patry, M., Davis, S. F., & Hansen, D. J. (2002). Factors influencing self-rated preparedness for graduate school: A survey of graduate students. *Teaching of Psychology*, 29(4), 275–281.

- Jaskyte, K. (2013). Does size really matter? Organizational size and innovations in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 24(2), 229–247.
- Jenkins, D. D., & Cutchens, A. A. (2011). Leading critically: A grounded theory of applied critical thinking in leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10(2), 1–21.
- Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33(1), 88–96.
- Kandiko, C. B., & Kinchin, I. M. (2013). Developing discourses of knowledge and understanding: Longitudinal studies of PhD supervision. *London Review of Education*, 11(1), 46–58.
- Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the “L” word in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 31(6), 71–99.
- Kivunja, C. (2015). teaching students to learn and to work well with 21st century skills: Unpacking the career and life skills domain of the new learning paradigm. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 1–11.
- Knowlton, D. S. (2003). Preparing students for educated living: virtues of problem-based learning across the higher education curriculum. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2003(95), 5–12.
- Kruss, G., Visser, M., & Aphane, M. (2012). *Academic interaction with social partners: Investigating the contribution of universities to economic and social development*. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Larson, W. (2013, Spring). A professional development project for school leaders: Including investigations of the value of the project to the participants. *AURCO Journal*, 19, 162–177. Retrieved from http://www.aurco.org/Journals/AURCO_Journal_2013/Professional_Development_AURCO_Vol19_2013.pdf
- Lechuga, V. M. (2011). Faculty-graduate student mentoring relationships: Mentors’ perceived roles and responsibilities. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 62(6), 757–771.
- Lei, S. A., & Chuang, N. (2009). Undergraduate research assistantship: A comparison of benefits and costs from faculty and students’ perspectives. *Education*, 130(2), 232–240.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Princeton, NJ: The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, The Education Schools Project.
- Lopez, R. (2014). The relationship between leadership and management: Instructional approaches and its connections to organizational growth. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 6(1), 98–112.
- Louw, J., & Muller, J. (2014). *A literature review on models of the PhD*. Retrieved from http://www.idea-phd.net/files/1814/1699/7672/Louw_and_Muller_2014_Literature_Review_on_Models_of_the_PhD.pdf
- Luce, D. (2011). Screening applicants for risk of poor academic performance: A novel scoring system using preadmission grade point averages and graduate record examination scores. *Journal of Physician Assistant Education*, 22(3), 15–22.
- Lurie, M. (2015). The age of agile leadership. *Chief Learning Officer*, 14(7), 26–33.
- Maher, M. A. (2005). The evolving meaning and influence of cohort membership. *Innovative Higher Education*, 30(3), 195–211.
- Maki, P. L., & Borkowski, N. A. (2006). *The assessment of doctoral education: Emerging criteria and new models for improving outcomes*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- McCrimmon, M. (2005). Thought leadership: a radical departure from traditional, positional leadership. *Management Decision*, 43(7/8), 1064–1070.

- Mendoza, P., Villarreal III, P. V., & Gunderson, A. (2014). Within-year retention among Ph.D. students: The effect of debt, assistantships, and fellowships. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(7), 650–685. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-014-9327-x>
- Meyers, E., Paul, P. A., Kirkland, D. E., & Dana, N. F. (2009). *The power of teacher networks*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Micek, T. A., Kim, S., & Weinstein, D. A. (2011). Factors influencing success of conditionally admitted students in graduate TESOL programs. *CATESOL Journal*, 23(1), 182–193.
- Mizell, H. (2010). Thought leaders: Who they are, why they matter, and how to reach them. *Journal of Staff Development*, 31(6), 46–51.
- Mizzi, R. C. (2014). Writing realities: An exploration of drawbacks and benefits of publishing while enrolled in a doctoral program. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development*, 26(2), 54–59.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2015). *Standards and protocols for the collection and dissemination of graduating student initial career outcomes information for advanced degree candidates*. Bethlehem, PA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nacweb.org/uploadedFiles/Pages/advocacy/first-destination-survey-standards-and-protocols-advanced.pdf>
- Nelson, K. W., Canada, R. M., & Lancaster, L. B. (2003). An investigation of nonacademic admission criteria for doctoral-level counselor education and similar professional programs. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 42(1), 3–13.
- New York University. (2013). *Report to the Jim Joseph Foundation*. New York, NY: Author.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). A century of skills movements. *American Educator*, 34(1), 12–13.
- Roderick, C. (2009). Undergraduate teaching assistantships: Good practices. *Mountainrise*, 5(2), 1–20.
- Smith, S. J., Frey, B. B., & Tollefson, N. (2003). A collaborative cohort approach to teacher education: Modeling inclusive practices. *Action in Teacher Education*, 25(1), 55–62.
- Sweitzer, V. L. (2008). Networking to develop a professional identity: A look at the first-semester experience of doctoral students in business. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 113, 43–56.
- Takacs, C. G. (2007). *Students' academic decision-making processes and their consequences for curricular design*. Retrieved from <https://www.hamilton.edu/documents/Takacs-StudentsAcademicDecisionMakingProcessesandTheirConsequencesforCurricularDesign.PDF>
- Tewari, R., & Sharma, R. (2011). Managerial skills for managers in the 21st century. *Review of Management*, 1(3), 4–15.
- Thomas, S. J. (2004). *Developing thought leaders*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.
- Vaatstra, R., & Vries, R. (2007). The effect of the learning environment on competences and training for the workplace according to graduates. *Higher Education*, 53(3), 335–357.
- Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Conklin Bueschel, A., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wendler, C., Bridgeman, B., Cline, F., Millett, C., Rock, J., Bell, N., & McAllister, P. (2010). *The path forward: The future of graduate education in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Wrenn, J., & Wrenn, B. (2009). Enhancing learning by integrating theory and practice. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning In Higher Education*, 21(2), 258–265.
- Yitshaki, R. (2012). How do entrepreneurs' emotional intelligence and transformational leadership orientation impact new ventures' growth? *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 25(3), 357–374.

Appendix A. Doctoral Dissertations, Professional Presentations, and Articles by Fellows (Last Three Years)

- Abrams, A. (Forthcoming). *Chaplaincy education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Abrams, A. (2012). Being a light unto the nations: Amid the "hidden curriculum" of prayer, pastoral care and CPE, what do Jews have to contribute? *Journal of Jewish Spiritual Care*, 12(1), 13–23.
- Avidar, G. (Forthcoming). *Israel education at a crossroads between transmission and transition: A comparative case study of three Jewish day high schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Bitton, M. (Forthcoming). *NYC's Syrian-Jewish community* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Bitton, M. (2015, April 19). *American Jews and Israel—Trends and new directions*. Paper presented at the American Jews and Israel: A Relationship in Transition Conference, New York, NY.
- Bitton, M. (2015). In defense of particularism. *The Peoplehood Papers*, 12, 13–16.
- Bitton, M., & Cohen, S. M. (2015). *More is better when it comes to Jewish numbers*. Retrieved from <http://forward.com/opinion/national/306669/why-we-need-the-numbers/>
- Bordelon, J. (2014a). *Beyond separation: Jews, parochial, schools, and the state. 1945–present* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Bordelon, J. (2014b). *Interfaith collaboration is a Southern tradition*. Retrieved from <http://jewishobservernashville.org/2014/10/30/interfaith-collaboration-is-a-southern-tradition/>
- Bordelon, J. (2015). *Choice and the chosen: The divided debate of Jews & school choice*. Retrieved from <http://www.myjewishlearning.com/southern-and-jewish/choice-the-chosen-the-divided-debate-of-jews-school-choice/>
- Emerson, M. (Forthcoming). *The teaching of Tanach in Orthodox day schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Friedman, J. (Forthcoming). *Rabbis' sermons as an educational vehicle for clarifying denominational identity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Galpert, D. (2013, December 18). *Putting social media to work for school public relations*. Presented at Educational Technology and Social Media Seminar of JED Camp, New York, NY.
- Gottlieb, O. (Forthcoming). *Game design for fostering interest and curiosity in Jewish history: A mobile, design-based research study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Gottlieb, O. (2012). An agenda for Jewish games for learning. *The Journal of the Steinhardt Foundation for Jewish Life*, 15(1), 9.
- Gottlieb, O. (2013a). *Case study two: Jewish time jump: New York*. In K. Schrier (Ed.), *Learning, education, & games*. Retrieved from http://press.etc.cmu.edu/files/Learning-Education-Games_Schreier-et-al-web.pdf
- Gottlieb, O. (2013b). Game design seedlings: "Multi-dimensional modeling." *Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility*, 13–14.
- Gottlieb, O. (2013c). Media Studies orientations for Israel education: Lessons from "In Treatment," "Homeland," and "Z-Cars." *Journal of Jewish Education*, 79(1), 49–69.
- Gottlieb, O. (2013d). You can't wrap herring in an iPad: Digitization of sacred Jewish books, the stripping of embodied ritual, and implications for Jewish education. *CCAR Journal: The Reform Jewish Quarterly*, 130–141.

- Gottlieb, O., Benjamin, B. C., & Jacobs, A. (2015, June 8–11). *New critical perspectives on Jewish education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.
- Levites, A. (Forthcoming). *The teaching and learning of Jewish spirituality among American Jewish adults* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Levites, A., Smokler, D., Kelman, A. Y., & Cohen, S. M. (2015, June 8–11). *Toward an educational vision for Jewish young adults*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.
- Levites, A., & Stone, I. (2013). Carrying the burden of the other: Musar and adult development. In Jeffrey S. Kress (Ed.), *Growing Jewish minds, growing Jewish souls: Promoting spiritual, social, and emotional growth in Jewish education*. New York, NY: URJ Press.
- Lewis, B. (Forthcoming). *Jewish homeschooling and homeschooled* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York.
- Williams, M., Bitton, M., Cohen, S. M., & Benor, S. (2015, June 8–11). *Responses to cultural authorities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.
- Willig, S. (Forthcoming). *Individualized education and its roots in the Slabodka Yeshiva* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Zakai, S., Hassenfeld, J., & Sales, A. (2015, June 8–11). *Israel and Israel education in a time of conflict?* Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.



1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
202.403.5000 | TTY 877.334.3499
www.air.org